

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

STAN R. MITCHELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

SANTANDER CONSUMER USA, INC.  
and CEDRIC GAUSE,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

13-cv-97-bbc

Plaintiff Stan Mitchell, a resident of Raleigh, North Carolina has filed a lawsuit alleging that defendants violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. Plaintiff has asked for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and has supported his request with an affidavit of indigency. The standard for determining whether plaintiff qualifies for indigent status is the following:

- From plaintiff's annual gross income, the court subtracts \$3700 for each dependent excluding the plaintiff.
- If the balance is less than \$16,000, the plaintiff may proceed without any prepayment of fees and costs.
- If the balance is greater than \$16,000 but less than \$32,000, the plaintiff must prepay half the fees and costs.
- If the balance is greater than \$32,000, the plaintiff must prepay all fees and costs.
- Substantial assets or debts require individual consideration.

In this case, plaintiff has no dependents. He receives \$200 per month in income from his job at Regal Theaters. Plaintiff's annual income of \$2,400 is well below the threshold to qualify for indigent status. Therefore, plaintiff can proceed without any prepayment of fees or costs.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Stan Mitchell's complaint is taken under advisement. As soon as the court's calendar permits, plaintiff's complaint will be screened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 to determine whether the case must be dismissed either because the complaint is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. Plaintiff will be notified promptly when such a decision has been made. In the meantime, if plaintiff needs to communicate with the court about this case, he should be sure to write the case number shown above on his communication.

Entered this 11th day of February, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

  
PETER OPPENEER  
Magistrate Judge